

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Tuesday, January 23, 2018

77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Michael Brown; Kyle Katz; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore

Absent: Tedd Hardesty

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan Blechschmidt, Daniel Morehead; Kelly Sciotto

II. Approval of the December 19, 2017 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve (7-0) SW – noted the need for accounting of the condition on case 17-12-2 (101 E. Main St.) to account for window submission.

III. Conceptual Review

Case #1 18-1-1C

00:12

Address: 195 E. Main Street

Applicant and Design Professional : Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design / co: Sarah Mackert

Property Owner: 195 East Main Street LLC

Request:

Conceptual Review for an 8-story mixed-use building. Components include:

- Ground floor commercial with parking in rear
- Sidewalk café
- Second floor amenity space, both for commercial and residences.
- 7 stories of residences
- Demolition of existing one story

Additional request for demolition of existing building.

Discussion: SM – Plans are very conceptual at this time. 0 lot line, 8 story. Retail on ground, some amenity on second floor with residential above. JB - Emerging restaurants and bars on 4th and Main. Younger clientele, smaller units, responding to lifestyle. Elevated terrace – quasi public. Giving space back to the neighborhood. SW don't have much in the way of elevations. SM – client has expressed desire for progressive (modern, West Coast) exterior. JM – addressing parking in the rear and residents experience with that will be a challenge. Not dark or oppressive. Also, no elevator on the western side of the building. It would be a long corridor for residents on this side when coming in from the east. SM - .75 parking ratio plus bicycle parking.

Residents will be living a more urban lifestyle and not always entering thru parking. RL – is parking just for the residents? SM – there might be some for users of retail. All for this building. RL – how will access to the parking be controlled – by a fence or wall and gate? Access is all off of Nobile St. ML – will you be pulling into those parking spaces off of Nobile? SM – that was our initial though, but we could change. MB – If you could get more building and less surface parking you could get more density. RL – what is your time frame – real schedule? This has a long way to go. SM – come back in a couple of months with a schematic design at least. RL – we have a long standing policy of not tearing down buildings. I don't think that anyone will object to tearing down this building but we need more in the way of finalized drawings. KK – we also wish to have demonstration of financing. SW – we want to make sure that before the existing building comes down, you are ready to go. SM – closing is around Feb. 2. JB – this group is definitely serious about this project. SW – we'll try not to hold you up. RL – there is no economic advantage of knocking it down sooner. JB – owners consider this to be a liability issue. RL – then secure it. SW – on a conceptual basis, we do not have a problem.

Result: No vote taken. Favorable review but would not approve demolition until finalized drawings presented and approved.

IV. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #2 18-1-2

10:50

Address: 245 South High Street – Beatty Building

Applicant & Property Owner: Lifestyle Communities

Design Professional: Meleca Architecture

Request CC3359.05, CC3359.23

Certificate of Appropriateness to make revisions to the Beatty Building . Reduction of one story from 10 to 9 stories. at the southwest corner of High and Rich. Detail changes are also proposed.

Discussion: SW – no issue with going from 10 to 9 stories, the issue has more to do with some detail changes. LS – the building will still look like it is 10 stories. Quick update of progress and expected deadlines of downtown projects given. Beatty – currently under construction. Market has changed for penthouses. All of top floors will be changed to regular units. This will create a higher density and also more affordable units. Some modifications have been made. Continuation of the barrel vault has been eliminated, and just a parapet kept. RL – what is dark material on top? SW – windows on top look too small. LC - we noticed that too are in the process of revision. Right now, those are false windows, they now go into stair cases. They can be frosted out and back lit. We can send these revisions. Original windows were into a unit. The rounded arches will remain. RL – concern about the line of cornice. It should continue. I don't think the small windows are a problem. A balcony remains. Clarification of materials. RL – move to approve the changes in the design as long as the segmented cornice returns. SW – how about other elevations? JM – west looks pretty bland. Some form of embellishment is needed. RL – suggestion of reference detail on the upper floors. A simplified detail. LS – first 5 or 6 floors is covered by adjacent parking garage. (Sheet 8)

Result: Approved, submit revised drawings to subcommittee of Loversidge and Lusk for approval of detail. (8-0)

Case #3 18-1-3

29:03

Address: 275 S. Front Street / Matan Project**Applicant & Property Owner:** Lifestyle Communities**Attorney:** Crabbe Brown & James / John Kennedy**Architect:** Niles Bolton Associates (Atlanta)**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for substitution of material in selected areas (brick to EIFS) – see statement.

The project was presented to the Commission on a conceptual basis at their June 2017 meeting.

In October 2017 the Commission was given an update, particularly about the status of the Library Park Drive conversion to a promenade.

Discussion will also focus on off-site temporary buffers for existing Motorist surface parking.

Discussion: LC – changes highlighted in yellow. Currently brick, metal panel and cementitious. Building at corner of Front and Main will remain as is. Elsewhere, the mid portion will be changed to EIFS (with a brick pattern). Samples shown. New materials will allow recesses to be shown. Still working on color relationships. Individual “brick” product also looked at. LS in a little bit of a bind in terms of making these 3 downtown buildings work (financially). JM – what is life cycle? LC – advancements have been made. Examples of other buildings – Huntington, Joseph, Grant Hospital. Keeping the detailing is important. The ground floor will still be brick with a cast stone base. We are not trying to match colors, we don’t want a near miss (RL- concurs). We will have exact expels with colors. RL – base and top should be distinctive from the middle. I think the Commission should see the materials. I’m having trouble with a whole façade downtown going to this material. Having top and particularly bottom (street level) solid materials would be the way to go. I’m not enamored by the sample. JM – could the Front St. façade be handled differently? Maybe the other facades could use EIFS. Is cementitious board and batten durable and appropriate? LC – Along Front St. the west corner will be brick, almost exclusively and the entrance will be metal panels. so it will be broken up. Individual brick EIFS is more expensive. SW – I do have a problem with going from what was essentially a brick project to a project that is largely EIFS. JK – we are dealing with economies of scale, keeping with the original design, which everyone seemed to like. KK – there is no question that this is a compromise. It’s not ideal, but construction prices are rising. I think we’ll be seeing more of this. How we continue to have development and not compromise too much. RL – our inherent objection is in bait and switch. SW – stucco can be well done or done poorly. SC – we are keeping a historic building and working around it material-wise. We could have torn this building down and gotten more units in. Our intention was not bait and switch but rather where we are today. Construction costs are going up. RL – with the EIFS, will the same profile and depth be maintained? KK – we’d like to see it again. OB – I don’t think this is bait and switch. This is a \$22M project. The operative word is getting it done. We need to be a little flexible. KK – move for substitution of this project under the condition that he applicant return with samples including colors. JM – include section details (i.e. – windows and sills). ML – 2nd.

Result: Approved, bring in material samples of top middle and base. (7-1) Wittmann - no

Case #4 18-1-4

43:30

Address: 265 E. State Street**Applicant:** Borrer / Matt Canterbury**Design Professionals :** M + A Architects / Tim Donahugh
EDGE Group , Landscape Architects / Paul Latta**Property Owner:** Borrer**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for a new 6 story mixed used building with ground floor retail /office and 5 stories of apartments above. Parking in the rear and underneath. Includes demolition of buildings.

This project was heard on a conceptual basis in November 2017.

Discussion: MC - No changes in plan and density since November. Some changes in State Street façade. Will come back for signage and exterior lighting. Will be following the Downtown Streetscape Standards along State Street. Revised façade reflects comments from the Nov. Commission meeting. A little more articulation (brick entrance) and less flatness. A lot more interest and dynamic. More detail added to brick work. Materials presented. Back façade and some side (east, south and courtyard) facades will be stucco. Primary façade, apart from brick, will be a fibrous cementitious (west and north). Joint lines will align with architecture. Color and material clarification, including windows. Parking screening will be the same material as the 303 S. Front St. building. The commercial space on the east might be a café or restaurant, but at this time it is unknown as to what this would be. There is enough room on the sidewalk that a tenant could activate the space. JM – some concerns with the eastern courtyard- the amount of light. MC – we’ve explored that and believe it is adequate as an amenity. It’s a challenge to find the right plant material. PL – it will also get reflective sunlight from adjacent buildings. KK – move for acceptance. DP – 2nd.

Result: Motion to approve (7-1-0) Loversidge recusing

Case #5 18-1-5

1:03:00

Project: *Millennial Tower* **Location:** Southwest corner of Front and Rich Streets**Applicant:** Arshot Investment Corporation**Property Owner:** Bicentennial Plaza Holding Company, Ltd., et.al**Attorney:** Michael B. Coleman**Design Professionals:** SRSS of Ohio, Inc. /
Urban Design LLC, David Rectenwald, AIA
MKSK - Landscape Architects / Jeff Pogonis**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for a major mixed-use retail / office / hotel / residential & parking building. Includes LED blade sign and marquee. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion: SW – two Commissioners have to leave early and were given opportunity to speak about project. DP- excellent job on listening and making changes. MC – introduces team. Refined proposal, seeking final approval. Listening, adjusting and responding to prior reviews. Ready to go with project – equity partners, investors and tenants. Statement building, bold and beautiful. \$150M project, 1450 employees, tallest building in core of downtown in 20 years. 750,000 sq. ft. space, 679

parking spaces, 155,000sf of office, 138 housing units and 40,000sf of retail. Hotel with 130 guest rooms. Site plan with access points for various uses shown.

Attracting and keeping retail downtown has been an issue. 5 minute radius of site 2,500 residents and 30,000 office occupants, 7,500 parking spaces. Building / retail will create a focal point and synergy. We have enough residents downtown to make it work. Retail will bring other retail.

Image shown of prior proposal. Image shown of current proposal. Significant and substantial changes made. Dynamic sign yet appropriate in scale. Satisfactory in terms of promoting retail on site. Blade sign relates to the proportions of tall building. It also fits architecture. Retail is ground floor and floor above. Marquee is 14 ft. above grade and 7' tall and 86' wide. Blade sign is 88'-5". Sign is on premise graphic only. No advertising. Changeable copy, will be dimmed at night, brightness – will not exceed .3 foot-candles over ambient light (which is the standard in the industry and City Code provision – that do not explicitly apply to downtown). This sign, after hours (sunset), will not be brighter than a mercury vapor street light. Automatic dimmer. KK – had to leave early – commented that the project has gone a long way – much more dramatic. The blade sign is appropriate in scale. No problem with any of it – a great project.

Look at the streetscape – MKSK – general conformance with the streetscape standards – some deviation to accommodate retail exposure on first and second levels. Entrances are articulated with change in material as per standards. Riversouth District has already done a lot of elements that are in conformity or similar, to the standards – granite curbs, planters, etc. Marquee along Front limits the trees. Shade trees (maples to match, as best we can, across the street) - at corner of Front and Rich. Bike racks. Streetscape is not dissimilar to what was installed at the LeVeque. Brick will also match what is across the street.

SRSS (A) – Presentation of the architecture and space program of the building. Basement level parking, street level and 2nd story retail. The ground floor retail will open to an open market event space off of Front. There will be a major stair case. Hotel is being handled by another. The parking footprints are level to allow for potential other uses in the future. The floor heights of the parking levels are 14' to allow for other uses (on 3 of the 6 parking levels) and mechanical parking lifts. Office level above parking includes exterior amenity spaces. Open floor plates are favored. The 13th floor includes an amenity space that will be linked to the office users, including a common outdoor lounge space. Above the offices space will be a hotel. Design aspects such as elevator shaft locations are being coordinated. Above the hotel is residential, which includes outdoor amenities such as a dog park. Elevations and its use of materials emphasize verticality. A – amenity space is for joint use for both the hotel and residences as well as other occupants. Residences will be a combination of condos and apartments. Lower levels will be smaller units. Tower starts after the amenity deck. Balconies will be separated by opaque glass. 12" post tension concrete slab. Roof plan shown – will have high screen wall and opportunity for graphic. Cooling towers on roof.

4 types of glass will be used on the elevations., samples provided. Retail space will have clear glass. Screening for parking deck levels – two different systems. Parking will be naturally ventilated. Openness is necessary. Tensile mesh system. High performance woven fiberglass. MB – encourages up lighting with changeable colors, of mesh. A – Lighting will be an LED strip light. Different glass types per tower and rest. This helps to aesthetically organize the building. Prior design looked like stacked books on shelf. ML – this is much better.

Lower level elevation details shown. RL – has Public Service been approached about overhang of marquee? A – our civil engineers have talked, also concerning encroachments below grade. Foundation system is all on the property. Clarification of “painted cantilevered slabs”. Balcony

guard rails will match the storefront system in terms of color (anodized bronze). MB – this plan is a radical improvement. Does LED screen product have any comparable products downtown? A – all of the LED's downtown are similar. MB – does the building have the capacity to adjust to market demand in terms of uses? (i.e. more office, less hotel). ML – blade sign – its integrated into the architecture. It does seem thin – could it be thicker? A – the blade does act like a seam. RL – it does have more weight from the perspective. SW – I like the blade sign but I wonder about the panels. Would this get too busy? MC – activities and tenants on premise. Brackets are more trim. RL – breaks it up like a Deco banding. Adjacent Rich Street property owner is concerned about increase in vehicular density, also in reference to all of the events that take place on the river. MB – motion to approve. RL – 2nd. Wanted to ask about signage for the retail. A – we anticipate there will be additional signage but this is not known at this time. Will come back. ML – what happens if the building were to change hands in terms of the LED. What would bind the new owner to what we approve? SW – I would think that one would have to return if one were to do something different. I think this needs to be part of our motion. RL – it should be there for the record. OB – the motion goes with the building, not with the owner. This could go down as a most improved submission. OB – it shows what communication can bring. Initially, it was like the project was driven by the sign. It is an important building that people from out to town will notice. Congratulations to all involved.

Result: Motion to approve. The marquee and blade signs are restricted to on premise graphics. (5-1-0) Maniace recusing.

V. Business / Discussion

2:06

Move to Michael B. Coleman Government Center

Official opening Monday, February 12

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (December 15, 2017)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. 288 E. Long St. – Development Project Mural – DeVere
2. ***154 N. Third St. – COTA CMax ad mural – Outfront***
3. ***260 S. Fourth St. – Scioto Downs ad mural – Orange Barrel***
4. ***66 S. Third St. – YMCA ad mural – Orange Barrel***
5. 530 W. Spring St. – Roof sign replacement – Burns&McDonnell
6. ***60 E. Spring St. – Impossible Burger ad mural – Orange Barrel***
7. ***274 S. Third St. – Impossible Burger ad mural – Orange Barrel***
8. 8 E. Broad St. – Reroof canopy and add downspout

Next regular meeting will be on February 27, 2018, the fourth Tuesday of the month (five weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.

2:17:37